

**FILED**

**JUL 23 2015**

**RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

TVIIM, LLC, a Colorado Limited liability  
company,

Plaintiff,

v.

MCAFEE, INC., a corporation,

Defendant.

**Case No. 3:13-cv-04545-HSG**

**VERDICT FORM**

**VERDICT FORM**

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

**I. INFRINGEMENT**

**1. Has TVIIM proven by a preponderance of the evidence that McAfee has infringed any of claims 1, 9, and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,168?**

For each of claims 1, 9, and 11, please check "Yes" (for TVIIM) or "No" (for McAfee).

<u>Claim</u>	<u>Yes (for TVIIM)</u>	<u>No (for McAfee)</u>
<b>1</b>		X
<b>9</b>		X
<b>11</b>		X

**II. INVALIDITY**

**1. Has McAfee proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of claims 1, 9, or 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,168 is invalid?**

For each of claims 1, 9, and 11, please check "Yes" (for McAfee) or "No" (for TVIIM).

<u>Claim</u>	<u>Yes (for McAfee)</u>	<u>No (for TVIIM)</u>
<b>1</b>	X	
<b>9</b>	X	
<b>11</b>	X	

1  
2 **III. DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)** *N/A*

3 If you found at least one of TVIIM's asserted patent claims both infringed and did not find  
4 that the claim was invalid, proceed to answer the following two questions. If you did not  
5 find infringement of any valid patent claim, do not answer the two questions in Section  
6 III—please proceed to Section IV.

7 1. What sum of money do you find, by a preponderance of the evidence, would be a  
8 reasonable royalty to be paid by McAfee to TVIIM for any infringement by McAfee you  
9 have found?

10 \$ \_\_\_\_\_

11 2. Is the amount you found in Question 1 a one-time lump sum for past and future  
12 sales or a royalty for past sales only? Check one of the following:

13 One-time lump sum [\_\_\_\_]

14 -OR-

15 Royalty for past sales [\_\_\_\_]

16  
17 **IV. INEQUITABLE CONDUCT**

18 1. Has McAfee proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the asserted claims  
19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,168 was obtained by inequitable conduct before the Patent Office?

20 Please check "Yes" (for McAfee) or "No" (for TVIIM).

21 Yes \_\_\_\_ No X

22  
23 We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to set out above, and return them under  
24 the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

25  
26 Date: 7/23/15

PAM CAMERON

27 Foreperson